Docket No.: 52352-372

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re Application of

Jeffrey A. SHIELDS, et al.

Serial No.: 09/498,336

Filed: February 04, 2000

For:

CF4 + H2O PLASMA ASHING FOR REDUCTION OF CONTACT/VIA

Group Art Unit: 2812

Examiner: V. Perez

RESISTANCE

## **REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

ssioner for Patents gton, DC 20231

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 imposed in the Office Consideration of the rejection Action dated July 17, 2001 is solicited in light of the following Remarks:

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for obviousness predicated upon the acknowledged prior art in view of Solis.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the acknowledged prior art methodology by removing the photoresist layer employing an etch gas mixture comprising CF<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O in view of the teaching by Solis that such an etch gas mixture is very aggressive. This rejection is traversed.

WDC99 499366-1.052352.0372